

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 26 2004

2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037-3213
T 202.293.7060
F 202.293.7860

www.sughrue.com

FAX

Date November 26, 2004

To Examiner KOSOWSKI, Alexander J.

Of PTO Group Art Unit 2125

Fax (703) 872-9306

From Howard L. Bernstein / Ronald Kimble

Subject: Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Our Ref Q67776 Appln No 10/023,807

Conf No 4027 Inventors Yoshihiro INOMATA

Pages 6 (including cover sheet)

Please call attention to problems with this transmission by return fax or telephone. Thank you.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS COMMUNICATION IS CONFIDENTIAL, MAY BE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED, AND IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE ADDRESSEE. UNAUTHORIZED USE, DISCLOSURE OR COPYING IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED AND MAY BE UNLAWFUL. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US.

This fax filing includes:

1. This cover sheet
2. Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

Sir,

I hereby certify that the above identified correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to Examiner KOSOWSKI, Alexander J. at the Patent and Trademark Office on November 26, 2004 at (703) 872-9306.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald Kimble
Reg. No. 44,186

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 26 2004

PATENT APPLICATION
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q67776

Yoshihiro INOMATA

Appln. No.: 10/023,807

Group Art Unit: 2125

Confirmation No.: 4027

Examiner: KOSOWSKI, Alexander J.

Filed: December 21, 2001

For: LOCKER SYSTEM, LOCKER CONTROLLING METHOD, CONTROL CENTER, AND
RECORDING MEDIUM

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated August 25, 2004, please kindly consider the following remarks.

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are all the claims pending in the application. These claims stand rejected under a second, non-final rejection. Specifically, claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moreno (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0035515), in view of Cayne et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0147525).

The basis of the rejection is similar to the rejections provided in the February 18, 2004 Office Action using only Moreno. In response to that rejection, Applicants submitted a May 18,